Application No. 10/529,210

Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2008

SUPPORT FOR AMENDED CLAIMS

The support for amended claims 1–2 and 5–7 is found in the same claims as

previously presented. Support for new Claims 8–15 are as follows:

• Claim 8: page 18, lines 21–23,

• Claim 9: page 18, lines 25–27,

• Claim 10: page 8, lines 23–25,

• Claims 11 and 12: page 9, lines 13–21,

• Claim 13: page 13, lines 29–31,

• Claim 14: page 13, lines 33–36,

• Claim 15: page 16, lines 11–13,

• Claim 16: page 18, lines 27–29.

New matter has not been added. Claims 1–16 are currently pending.

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4 and 8-10 relate to methods for printing sheetlike or three-dimensional

substrates by the ink jet process comprising utilizing a thermally crosslinkable, aqueous

recording fluid containing random polyurethane copolymers and one or more melamine

derivatives as crosslinkers in a printing process.

Claim 5 relates to printed sheetlike or three-dimensional substrates obtained by the

method of claim 1.

Claims 6 and 11–15 relate to processes for preparing a colorant preparation for

recording fluids as defined in claim 1 comprising a mixture of random polyurethane

copolymers and one or more melamine derivatives as dispersing binders, water, optionally

one or more organic solvents and a finely divided inorganic or organic colorant, which

6

Application No. 10/529,210 Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2008

comprises mixing together in a ball mill dispersing binders, water, optionally one or more organic solvents and a finely divided inorganic or organic colorant.

Claims 7 and 16 relate to a colorant preparations for recording fluids, obtained by the process of claim 6.

The rejection of Claims 1 and 5–7 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as anticipated by Wilson et al. (WO 03/029362 A2) and the rejection of Claims 2–4 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious in view of the same reference are respectfully traversed on the ground that this reference may not be properly cited as prior art against the present claims. Specifically, Wilson et al. was filed on September 27, 2002, and published on April 10, 2003. The present application is a § 371 application of International Patent Application No. PCT/EP03/010656, filed on September 25, 2003. Thus, the United States filing date of the parent application is September 25, 2003 and Wilson et al. is therefore not available under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b). Moreover, Wilson et al. is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(a), and the corresponding U.S. Publication (US 2005/0065234 A1) is not available as prior art under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e), because the present claims enjoy a priority dating of September 27, 2002. In support of thisargument, Applicants submit herewith a certified English translation of German priority document (DE 102 45 209.1) thereby perfecting priority.

Application No. 10/529,210 Reply to Office Action of January 14, 2008

Accordingly, <u>Wilson et al.</u> is disqualified as a reference against the claims; the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) and 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) are therefore obviated.

Applicants submit that the application is now in condition for allowance, and early notification of such action is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

OBLON, SPIVAK, McCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.

 $\begin{array}{c} \text{Customer Number} \\ 22850 \end{array}$

Tel: (703) 413-3000 Fax: (703) 413 -2220 (OSMMN 08/07)

Stephen G. Baxter

Registration No. 32,884